

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 25.—JULY, 1893.

I. NATURAL RELIGION AND THE GOSPEL.

ASSUMING that theology is a science, and that it pursues the method of definition adopted by all sciences, that is to say, one derived from the object-matter about which they are concerned, we define it, with others, to be the science of religion. But religion, comprehensively taken, is easily distributable into two kinds: natural religion and evangelical religion, or, briefly, redemption. The latter member of this division is the gospel. These are the only two schemes of religion that God has given to man. The first was communicated to Adam in innocence, the latter to Adam and his race in sin. The gospel, specifically considered, has been developed in great dispensational forms contradistinguished to each other, not as to their essential, but as to their peculiar and distinctive, features; but, generically considered, it is as a scheme of religion contradistinguished to natural religion. It is, therefore, interesting and important to ascertain the relations which subsist between natural religion and the gospel; and we propose to indicate their points of similarity and difference. What are the elements of natural religion? How do they come to be incorporated into the gospel? And what are the peculiar and differentiating elements of the latter scheme?

I. Their points of similarity.

1. Some of their contents are alike. Taking it for granted that the articles which will be enumerated are, in some sense, embodied in the gospel, the question will be whether they were component parts of natural religion.

(1.) The doctrine of God's existence. It cannot be supposed

seed of the word has found lodgment where we may trust it to the quickening energy of the divine Spirit, and whence it will not return void.

3. It would tend to restore our faith in the reliable efficacy, for spiritual regeneration, of the patient, persistent brooding of wise and faithful pastoral love—a faith which, we fear, is greatly weakened by over-confidence in less quiet, less persistent, more startling, and over-much lauded appliances, the type of which is not the patiently brooding hen, but the patent incubator, from which huge flocks of unmothered chickens are sent forth screaming together.

4. It would tend to a better recognition and more faithful use of the divine provision for spiritual regeneration of infants. We speak now of “infants dying in infancy.” These are taken away from our arms and care, and, although not from our love, yet altogether from our responsibility. We would leave them trustfully to him who gave and has taken them. Would that our creeds would leave them thus without either affirmative or negative dogmas, none of which are so clearly deduced from Scripture as we rightly insist that all ecclesiastical dogmas should be.

We speak of the regeneration of infants as God’s sweet gift to the parental faith in which they are begotten and born, wholly irrespective of his decree as to the length of their earthly lives—whether a fraction of an hour or the whole of a century. We speak of that regeneration *in* infancy, so early that the whole conscious and responsible life is a regenerate life,—a life in which there has been no year, no month, no hour of impenitence. We seriously maintain that a better study and use of the terms chiefly considered in this paper, and a better regulation of our thinking by means of them in such more accurate use, would greatly help believing parents to generate, to nurture, and to rear their offspring in a faith which assures their salvation, not as a rescue by conversion from a career of impenitent sin, of long or of short duration, but as a setting of life right toward God and in God from its very beginning. This, we believe, is the true, scriptural race redemption.

HENRY A. NELSON.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THAT the date of this venerable version is an important factor in the critical problems of the Old Testament is well known to all who are in touch with the current literary and textual discussions. That its ori-

gin is involved in deep obscurity is equally well demonstrated and familiar. For the letter of Aristeas reveals its fraudulent character on its very face, while the later embellishment of the story as to the seventy-two cells, the seventy-two translators, the seventy-two days, is no more trustworthy than the Talmudic tradition which asserts that its completion was accompanied by tremendous portents and disastrous consequences to Israel. Neither can much credence be put in the testimony of Aristobulus as recorded in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica*; while Clement only reproduces the current tradition. And yet there are grains of truth in the tradition itself, and what is reliable may be summed up in the statement in which all scholars would concur:

(1), The LXX. owes its existence to the desire of the Greek-speaking Jews in Egypt to possess the Old Testament in what was now their vernacular; (2), The translation was made by men of varying ability, at different times, extending over a century or more, and beginning with the Pentateuch; (3), The greater part, if not the whole, of the version, was executed at Alexandria. Fresh light on the date and origin of this version is plainly desirable, and should be welcomed, however much it might militate against our traditional beliefs, however much it might serve to corroborate the views of the Higher Criticism in regard to the close of the canon and the existence of Maccabean psalms.

More direct external evidence seems out of the question, though certainly not beyond the range of possibilities; but Prof. H. Graetz, of Breslau, had discovered, before called up higher, some internal evidence of great value, which evidence it is the purpose of this paper to present, together with some material gleaned from another source, without, however, indicating, on the writer's part, more than a general acceptance of the results so reached. Dr. Graetz's view is that the LXX. was made neither in the days of Ptolemy I., surnamed Soter, nor in the days of Ptolemy II., called Philadelphus, but in the time of Ptolemy VI., called also Philometor. That is, the earliest portions of the version were executed at least a hundred years later than claimed by the current tradition. This view is supported mainly by inferences hinging upon verbal criticisms.

1. As is well known one of the main differences that divided the Pharisees and Sadducees turned on the date of the Feast of Pentecost, and arose from diverse interpretations of the text of the law which regulated the date of said feast. That law is Leviticus xxiii. 15, and reads:

סְפַרְתֶּם לָכֶם מִמֶּהֱרַת הַשַּׁבָּת מִיּוֹם הַבִּיאָתְכֶם אֶת־עֹמֶר
 הַתְּנוּפָה שִׁבְעַ שַׁבָּתוֹת תְּמִימֹת תִּהְיֶינָה

What is meant by מִמֶּהֱרַת הַשַּׁבָּת? The Sadducees understood it to mean that the counting was to be made from the day after the Sabbath of the Passover, and that, therefore, the Feast of Pentecost being exactly seven weeks after, ought always to fall on a Sabbath. The Pharisees, however, understood the word "Sabbath" in the law to mean the first day of the Passover, whatever day in the week it might be. Pentecost, therefore, being exactly seven weeks afterwards, might come on any day of the week. The expression מִמֶּהֱרַת הַשַּׁבָּת is unambiguous and clear enough, and the Revised Version gives an exact translation: "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven Sabbaths shall there be complete." When, however, we turn to the LXX. text, we find no literal rendering, but a remarkable divergence from the Hebrew. That version has τῆ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης in verse 11 and τῆς ἐποήριον τῶν σαββάτων in verse 15. Nor is there much doubt in regard to the genuineness of the reading. Origen, indeed, had noticed a variant τοῦ σαββάτου or μετα τὸ σαββᾶτον in verse 11, and this reading is reflected in a small group of existing cursives. But these MSS. probably were influenced by recensional tendencies, and the most valuable and early witnesses, A, B, F,¹ agree in the present lection. Moreover, the Pentateuch at least was used in the worship of the Alexandrian προσηγορίαι, and it is not conceivable that the original reading which favored the Sadducees in a matter of so great importance should have been altered out of love to Pharisaism. A translation which has been in use some time is not readily changed for a rendering directly opposite, especially when opposed by so large and influential a body as the sect of the Sadducees,

¹ A in the textual criticism of the Old Testament in Greek is the well known Codex Alexandrinus; B is the Codex Vaticanus, 1209; F, however, is neither the Codex Borcelianus, nor the Graeco-Latin Codex Augiensis, but the Codex Ambrosianus, bought in Coreyra by Cardinal F. Borromeo. See further, PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, Vol. V., p. 306-7, and the introduction to Dr. Henry B. Swete's "Old Testament in Greek," Vol. I, 1887. And, by the way, the writer takes this opportunity to withdraw the statement made in the QUARTERLY as to MS. F. Further research has entirely convinced him of the recensional characteristics of that MS.; only he does not yet admit the original character of B., but agrees with the conclusion of Lagarde (*Septuaginta Studien*, 1891, p. 72), that in Judges, at least, A exhibits the preferable text.

who were the people's party of Judaism. Because, therefore, the translation $\tau\eta\ \xi\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omega\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\varsigma$ does violence to the exact meaning of $\text{מְמַהֲרֵת הַשְּׂבֵת}$ it seems to be the original meaning. What then? The LXX. distinctly favors the erroneous interpretation of the Pharisees, and accentuates their antagonism toward the Sadducees. It must, therefore, have been made after the antagonism between Pharisees and Sadducees in reference to the date of Pentecost became pronounced. And since that antagonism arose out of the Maccabean wars, the work cannot have been executed before the days of Jonathan Maccabeus, 161-143, B. C.

2. *Βασιλεύς* is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew מֶלֶךְ and as a general thing מֶלֶךְ and מַמְלָכָה are rendered by *βασιλεύς* and *βασιλεία* respectively as is right. And such, without exception, is the usage in reference to nations outside of Israel, as Moab, Edom, Sodom, etc, who were antagonistic to Israel and uninfluenced by its Messianic and political hopes. But there are certain classes of passages in which מֶלֶךְ is not represented by *βασιλεύς*, but by *ἀρχων*, and that in plain defiance of the literal and historic signification. These are:

Gen. xvii. 6: $\text{מֶלְכִים מִמָּדָה יֵצְאוּ}$ = *βασιλείς ἐκ σοῦ ἐξέλθουσιν*.

Gen. xvii. 16: $\text{מֶלְכֵי עַמִּים מִמְּנָה}$ = *βασιλείς ἐθνῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται*.

Gen. xxxv. 11: $\text{מֶלְכִים מִחִלְצִיָּה יֵצְאוּ}$ = *βασιλείς ἐκτῆς ὀσφύος σου ἐξέλθουσιν*.

Gen. xxxvi. 31: $\text{מֶלֶךְ-מֶלֶךְ לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ = *προτοῦ βασιλεύσαι βασιλεία ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*.

II. Num. xxiii. 21: $\text{בּוֹ מֶלֶךְ וְתִרְוַעַת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ}$ = *τὰ ἐνδοξα ἀρχόντων ἐν αὐτῷ*.

Deut. xxviii. 36: $\text{וְהָיָה אֵתְךָ וְאֵת-מֶלְכְּךָ}$ = *ἀπαγάγοι*

καὶ τοὺς ἀρχοντας σου.

Deut. xxxiii. 5: $\text{וְיָהִי בִישְׂרוֹן מֶלֶךְ}$ = *καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ ἡγαπῶμένῳ ἀρχων*.

Under this head comes the important law of the kingdom, Deut. xvii. 14-20.

Deut. xvii. 14: $\text{אֲשִׁימָה עָלַי מֶלֶךְ בְּכָל-הַגּוֹיִם}$ = *παταστήσω ἐπ' ἐμαυτὸν ἀρχοντα καθὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐθνη*.

Deut. xvii. 15 : שׁוֹם תָּשִׂים עָלֶיךָ מֶלֶךְ = καθιστῶν καταστήσεις ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν ἄρχοντα.

Deut. xvii. 15 : מִקָּרֵב אֲחֵיךָ תָּשִׂים עָלֶיךָ מֶלֶךְ = ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου καταστήσεις ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν ἄρχοντα.

Deut. xvii. 18 : וְהָיָה כְּשִׁבְתוֹ עַל כִּסֵּא מַמְלַכְתּוֹ = καὶ ὅταν καθίσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ.

Deut. xvii. 20 : עַל-מַמְלַכְתּוֹ = ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς.

III. Gen. xlix. 20 : וְהָיָה יִתְזוּ מִעַרְבֵי-מִלְכָּךְ = καὶ αὐτὸς ὁώσει τροφῆν ἄρχουσιν.

With the exception of those passages already mentioned, in which reference is had to the rulers of nations, other than Israel, where מֶלֶךְ is *always* rendered by βασιλεύς and מַמְלָכָה by βασιλεία, the citations above made cover all the translations of מֶלֶךְ and מַמְלָכָה in the Septuagint Pentateuch. They show, too, that βασιλεύς and ἄρχων are not used promiscuously and synonymously in this version of the Pentateuch as they seem to be in Sirach xli. 13, but rather that their employment was dictated by a fastidious deliberation which scrupulously avoided βασιλεύς wherever it might rouse suspicion, and retained it wherever offence was inconceivable. For class I. has to do with the Israelitish kingdom as a historic fact or else deals with prophecies, which, when this version was made, had already received an exhaustive fulfilment in the line of Abraham. But Israel even in exile clung to its laws and customs—yea, verily, clings to them yet—with a devotion unequalled among all the nations of the earth. For Israel, the laws of Moses were not repealed by national overthrow, nor did they cease to be obligatory. Along with this devotion to their own laws and customs, too, Israel hated the foreign yoke as a very curse of God, and the very first good opportunity was the occasion in those days for renewed attempts to regain that national independence the people so loved. Israel's sullen insubordination must have been known in the higher Egyptian circles. Under these circumstances, therefore, we need not be surprised that ἄρχων is used as the equivalent of מֶלֶךְ in those passages where the state of affairs described or enjoined is such as every Jew would gladly have restored. Indeed, when we consider Israel's position, we would be surprised did not

translators who had these people's interest at heart seek to soften expressions which might arouse suspicion. The Authorized Version and Revised Version translators have done similar things without laboring under such pressure, and the Septuagint translators were thus careful to use βασιλεύς in reference to past historic facts, but ἄρρων where the state of affairs described was a possible future contingency. That this was actually the case is further shown by the use of ἐν Γερουσαλίῃ for לְבַבֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל in Gen. xxxvi. 31, and more particularly in Gen. xlix. 20, which has been marked III. Here was a dubious case, and while βασιλεύς might not have been misinterpreted or misunderstood, still ἄρρων was the safest; and it is always best to err on that side. Thus the Septuagint Version, like all things else, is the resultant of certain factors, one of which it is hereby probable was the desire to avoid displeasing the reigning prince in any way. But who was this reigning prince? Ptolemy Philadelphus was a great collector of books, and might, therefore, be interested in the sacred books and customs of Israel, but "if there is any historic reality in the alleged interest taken by an Egyptian king in the translation of the law-book sacred to the Israelites, this can only be Ptolemy Philometor, who showed extraordinary favor to the Israelites living in Egypt. Israelitish generals and Israelitish troops helped him to fight against his hostile brother." And it was in the reign of Philometor that Onias founded the temple at Onion, in Egypt, which tended to increase the importance of the Jewish colonies, and to separate the Alexandrian from the Palestinian school. It is, therefore, probable that this king, who was the best and most tolerant of all the Ptolemies, was the one whose encouragement led to the translation of this most ancient version. The date of this king, too, 174-146 B. C., tallies well with that gained from our former observations as to the day of the Passover, viz.: 161-143 B. C.

3. So far, in my own statement, the theory of Professor Graetz. This theory gains confirmation in some particulars from recent finds made in Egypt; and by those same discoveries the Egyptian or Alexandrian origin is put beyond the shadow of a doubt.

W. M. Flinders Petrie is an indefatigable explorer who never leaves a stone unturned in the search for fresh light on the old questions. And Flinders Petrie has made what might almost be called the fortunate discovery that when you find nothing inside an Egyptian coffin you still have the coffin to work upon. For in Egypt wood was very scarce, and every stick of timber was needed for fruit or shade. None

was available in any shape for coffins. And, hence, under the influence of that necessity which is always the fruitful mother of inventions, the coffin-makers proceeded to make their coffins and mould them to fit the human form, by "laying together strips of paper either simply or with glue, and then covering the surface on both sides with a coat of Nile mud, upon which they printed designs and figures." The paper used in the preparation of these coffins was the ordinary writing paper made from the papyrus reed. More than that, it was paper that had actually been written upon and thrown aside as no longer of any value. And there we have it to-day, covered with writing in "every variety of hand, from the large, round hand of the youth writing to his father, to the shorthand notes of the clerk on the back of an old account." To separate, decipher, and sort these layers of written papyri is a task of no small magnitude; for the layers must be washed clear of mud, and to do that without effacing the writing is well-nigh impossible. Besides, where glue was used, the whole texture is riddled by worms which have gone in search of the glue and reduced the papyrus almost to powder. Yet Prof. J. P. Mahaffy, of Dublin, has sorted and deciphered the first instalment of the "Petrie Papyri," and his work lies before the public in Cunningham Memoir, No. 8.

Now, we are not specially interested in the literature of these precious papyri; for the vast majority of them are portions of household accounts, wills, and private correspondence. The only valuable scraps of literature are some pages of Plato's *Phædo* and the long-lost *Antiope* of Euripides. The dialect in which they are written, however, is the "mixed or common Greek dialect of later times, when the conquests of Alexander had made all Greek culture of one kind and type. But in the vocabulary we find a far closer likeness to the Greek of the Septuagint than to that of any other work" which might be named. Words occur in these papyri found nowhere else except in the version of the LXX. Moreover, such large specimens of this writing are dated in the reigns of the second and third Ptolemies (B. C. 274-225), that we can tell with tolerable certainty whether any new undated document belongs to this period. What then? The Septuagint is of Egyptian origin; and when we say Egyptian we might have said Alexandrian, for Alexandria was *the* place where such work would be done if done at all. So much is certain. This discovery does not, however, furnish a definite date for that translation. It might have been made in 274 B. C., or it may not have been made until much later times, for we must not forget the remarkable likeness to the simpler portions of

the New Testament. Mahaffy declares that he has "hunted with anxious care for the smallest trace of any such book, but in vain." And yet, on the ordinary hypothesis, the Pentateuch of that version had been in circulation sixty years at the time of the latest dated fragment! The truth is these documents only furnish us with the terminus *a quo*; later research must determine the terminus *ad quem* and the exact period of composition. The discovery of a coffin made in 130 B. C. would go far towards settling the question of the exact date. Meanwhile, the linguistic phenomena seem to permit, and the internal evidence seems to require, the translation of this venerable version at or about 150 B. C.

In conclusion, the writer desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to *The Sunday-School Times* and *The Expository Times* for material aid in the composition of this article.

R. B. WOODWORTH.

Duffields, W. Va.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1893.

Macon is a beautiful Southern city. Robed in fresh summer verdure, with broad, well-shaded, albeit dusty streets, ample lawns, and wide expanses of green, noble public buildings, and many elegant private mansions on commanding grassy eminences, lovely views of woodland, crest and river and undulating horizons, Macon presented a most attractive place for the meeting of the Assembly.

Everything that generous and thoughtful consideration could suggest, was done for the comfort and welfare of their guests; every convenience was provided, every wish anticipated. The courteous and accomplished pastor of the First Church, with a corps of efficient assistants, met, on incoming trains, the members of the Assembly, and delightful provision was made for their entertainment. The culture and hospitality of charming homes made each one's stay most enjoyable and memorable. The delicate compliment of high musical culture was paid the Assembly, in the unusual and delightful courtesy extended by the congregation to attend the rendition by the Macon Musical Association of Sir J. Stainer's Oratorio of "The Crucifixion." It was a rare pleasure, and the impression made was solemn and affecting. The ever-melting story of Calvary was told in fitting song, and its inimitable pathos and majesty were most tenderly and vividly illustrated.

The commissioners were generally enrolled, when the opening sermon was preached by the Rev. S. A. King, D. D., of Waco, Texas, the